

United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington
Magistrate Judge Mary K. Dimke
Richland

USA v. EDUARDO REYES-SANTANA Case No. 4:21-CR-06022-SAB-2

Richland Video Conference
The Defendant agreed to appear via video conference.

Arraignment on Indictment:

06/17/2021

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sara Gore, Courtroom Deputy [R]
<input type="checkbox"/> US Probation / Pretrial Services Officer

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody, appearing by video from the Sunnyside Jail. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Earl Hicks, US Atty (video)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alister Elvis Dabreo, Jr, Defense Atty (tele)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter NOT REQUIRED

<input type="checkbox"/> Defendant not present / failed to appear |
|---|--|

-
- | | |
|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rights given
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment of Rights previously filed
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant received copy of charging document
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant waived reading of charging document
<input type="checkbox"/> Charging document read in open court | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained
<input type="checkbox"/> Conditions of release as previously imposed |
|---|--|

REMARKS

Due to the current COVID-19 public health crisis, all parties including Defendant, appeared by video or teleconference.

Defendant appeared and was assisted by counsel and advised of his rights and the allegations contained in the charging document.

The Defendant acknowledged to the Court that his true and correct name is: Eduardo Reyes-Santana.

“Not guilty” plea entered.

Discovery to be provided pursuant to the local rule on discovery.

Oral order issued confirming the Government’s disclosure obligations under the Due Process Protections Act and the possible consequences of violation of said order. USA objects that the rule is overbroad and states the Government understands it’s discovery requirements. Court overrules objection. Written order to follow.

The Court ordered:

1. Matters involving detention have been previously heard and determined. Issue of detention not before the Court. Pre-existing Order of Detention will remain in full force.
2. Defendant shall be detained by the U. S. Marshal until further order of the Court.